arXiv:hep-ph/9307277v1 15 Jul 1993

CERN-TH.6942/93

Introduction to Thermal Field Theory

T. Altherr[1]

Theory Division, CERN, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland

Abstract

This is intended to be a very basic introduction and short (and of course incomplete) overview of thermal field theory. In the first part, I introduce the thermal propagator at a very simple level and give the Feynman rules using the time-path contour method. In the second part, I give examples of these rules in scalar theory and discuss the origin of the thermal mass and other important effects as infrared divergences and phase transitions. In the third part, I outline the resummation program of Braaten and Pisarski.

CERN-TH.6942/93

July 93

[1]On leave of absence from LAPP, BP110, F-74941 Annecy-le-Vieux Cedex, France.

1 Introduction

The goal of Thermal Field Theory (TFT) is to describe a large ensemble of multi-interacting particles (including possible non-Abelian gauge interactions) in a thermodynamical environment [1, 2]. The main activity of physicists in that field deals with the description of the canonical or grand-canonical ensembles, that is of systems at fixed temperature and chemical potential [3]. However, extensions to non-equilibrium systems also exist [4-7] (as well as a description in the micro-canonical ensemble [8]), but I will not discuss them here.

The TFT approach is different from older and more familiar theories such as the kinetic theory [9, 10] or many-body theory [11] in the sense that the TFT is endowed with the following advantages: i) it uses a path integral approach, ii) it can treat non-Abelian gauge interactions as QCD and iii) it is Lorentz-covariant.

Although the TFT is now almost 40 years old, its usefulness has been particularly acknowledged in the middle of the 70s, for the study of phase transitions in quantum field theories. Lately, most of the developments of the TFT [12, 13] have been motivated by the study of QCD at finite temperature, as the creation of the quark-gluon plasma in the laboratory becomes feasible.

Within the TFT, two classes of formalisms can be distinguished: one class is based upon a complex-time contour [4, 6, 14, 15, 16] and the other on C^* algebra [17]. I will only describe the former.

The main idea of the TFT is to use the path-integral approach of the usual vacuum field theory and describe the temperature that appears in the Boltzmann factor $\exp(-\beta H)$ using the time-evolution operator with complex time variables $t = -i\beta = -i/T$ (everywhere conventional units $\hbar = c = k = 1$ are used).

Historically [18], Matsubara [19] was the first to build a TFT by incorporating a purely imaginary time variable into the evolution operator. His name is associated with the discrete energy frequencies, the so-called Matsubara frequencies onto which one has to sum over in the Imaginary-Time Formalism (ITF). Then came some important contributions from Schwinger [14], Mills [15] and Keldysh [4] who developed a formalism based upon the choice of a contour in the complex plane. This is called the

Real-Time Formalism (RTF). The latest developments include a functional formulation of the theory [16]. Independently, Umezawa and coworkers [20, 21] have taken a different approach, based on C^* algebra, called Thermo-Field Dynamics (TFD), which turns out to give essentially the same results.

The main applications of the TFT in high energy physics can be sorted in three classes:

i) *Cosmology:* Obviously, if one is interested in the studies of hot plasmas, the early universe is a very good example. At any time before the recombination, the expansion length of the universe is much smaller than the mean free path between the particles, so that one can really speak of a perfectly thermalized plasma (at least under certain conditions [22]). This is also clearly demonstrated by COBE's results on the cosmic microwave background radiation, which shows a purely uniform black-body spectrum, up to fluctuations $\delta T/T \sim 10^{-5}$ [23]. The temperature of the primordial plasma ranges from the Planck mass down to a few eV [24].

In fact, the first and major success of the TFT concerns the symmetry restoration in spontaneously broken gauge theories at finite temperature [25-27]. This is also at the basis of the inflationary scenario [28]. This topic has recently been revived in the case of the electroweak theory, where the order of the phase transition is crucial for baryogenesis [29].

There exist other types of study in the early universe, as for instance the calculation of reaction rates taking place in the hot plasma in order to determine the abundances of some species [30]. One should also mention an excellent work by Rebhan on thermal corrections to quantum gravity [31].

ii) *Astrophysics:* Cores of neutron stars, supernovae, red giants and white dwarfs are composed of extremely dense plasmas ($\rho = 10^6$-10^{15}g/cm^3). The temperature can also be very high during the collapse of a supernova (a few tens of MeV). There does not exist many applications of the TFT in such systems, but recent studies on neutrinos and axions emission rates in these stars have proved to be quite useful [32-38].

iii) *Heavy-Ion collisions:* This concerns the formation of the quark-gluon plasma (QGP) in the laboratory [39]. Lattice calculations clearly show that QCD has a phase

transition at $T_c = 100$-200 MeV, above which hadronic matter is deconfined [40]. The TFT is an obvious and unavoidable tool in the study of the QGP and a lot of work has already been done in the calculation of signals from such matter [41-43].

This is almost all concerning particle physics. Of course, there are other fields of application as for instance condensed matter, for which TFD was in fact developed.

To be honest, the plasmon decay into $\nu\bar{\nu}$ pairs [35], which is the dominant cooling mechanism of red giants and white dwarfs, is so far the only experimental verification (although indirect) of the TFT in high-energy physics. Therefore, the support of such theories proceeds more by analogy with what is known from the classical case. It is hoped that each field cited above will bring, in the near future, observable verifications to these theories.

2 Thermal propagator

In this section, I will derive the thermal propagator in the simplest possible model, that is a free scalar field theory. All the relevant features of the TFT show up already at this simple level, so that extensions to more sophisticated theories will be straightforward.

The starting point of the TFT is the new definition of an observable A for a system in contact with a heat bath at fixed temperature T (in the canonical ensemble):

$$\langle A \rangle_\beta = Z^{-1} \mathrm{Tr} \left[e^{-\beta H} A \right], \tag{2.1}$$

where Z is the partition function. The Boltzmann factor weighs the occupation number of the states that are accessible to the system (here the trace is performed onto discrete states, but it can of course be continuous). The next step is to realize that the Boltzmann factor can be described by a rotation of the operator in the Heisenberg representation

$$e^{\beta H} A(t) e^{-\beta H} = A(t - i\beta), \tag{2.2}$$

where t is now a complex time variable. For analytic reasons, only some complex time values are allowed. For instance, by evaluating the double product

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}\ e^{-\beta H} A(t) B(t') &= \sum_m e^{-\beta E_m} \langle m | A(t) B(t') | m \rangle \\ &= \sum_{n,m} e^{-iE_n(t-t')} e^{iE_m(t-t'+i\beta)} \langle m | A(0) | n \rangle \langle n | B(0) | m \rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

it appears that the trace operation is meaninful only for time arguments in the range

$$-\beta < \mathrm{Im}(t-t') < 0. \tag{2.4}$$

Consider now the 2-point Green function in a scalar theory. By definition

$$\begin{aligned} G(X-Y) &= \langle T_c(\phi(X)\phi(Y))\rangle_\beta \\ &= \theta_c(x_0-y_0)G_+(X-Y) + \theta_c(y_0-x_0)G_-(X-Y), \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

where a complex time ordering has been defined ($\theta_c(x_0-y_0)=1$ if y_0 precedes x_0 along the contour). The domain of analyticity of the 2-point Green function is given by

$$\begin{aligned} -\beta \le \mathrm{Im}(x_0-y_0) \le 0 \quad &\text{when} \quad \theta_c(x_0-y_0)=1 \\ 0 \le \mathrm{Im}(x_0-y_0) \le \beta \quad &\text{when} \quad \theta_c(y_0-x_0)=1. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

This means that the contour in the complex plane must not go up but can only go down.

An important property, the Kubo-Martin-Schwinger (KMS) relation, can also be derived:

$$G_+(x_0-(y_0+i\beta),\vec{x}-\vec{y}) = G_-(X-Y), \tag{2.7}$$

which follows from the trace invariance by circular permutation.

We are now in a position to write down the 2-point Green function for a free scalar field in terms of operator kernels. Consider a superposition of creation and annihilation operators in the plane-wave approximation

$$\phi(X) = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega}}[a^\dagger(K)e^{iK\cdot X} + a(K)e^{-iK\cdot X}], \tag{2.8}$$

where $\omega = k_0 = \sqrt{|\vec{k}|^2+m^2}$. One finds for the thermal propagator

$$\begin{aligned} G(X-Y) &= \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{2\omega_k}} \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{2\omega_p}} \\ &\times \Big\{ \theta_c(x_0-y_0)\left[e^{-iK\cdot X+iP\cdot Y}\langle a(K)a^\dagger(P)\rangle_\beta + e^{iK\cdot X-iP\cdot Y}\langle a^\dagger(P)a(K)\rangle_\beta\right] \\ &+ \theta_c(y_0-x_0)\left[e^{iK\cdot X-iP\cdot Y}\langle a(K)a^\dagger(P)\rangle_\beta + e^{-iK\cdot X+iP\cdot Y}\langle a^\dagger(K)a(P)\rangle_\beta\right]\Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

There remains to calculate the thermal kernels. Taking for Hamiltonian

$$H = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{\omega}{2} : a(K)a^\dagger(K) + a^\dagger(K)a(K) :, \tag{2.10}$$

one can start from the thermal average of the commutation relation

$$\langle a(P)a^\dagger(K)\rangle_\beta - \langle a^\dagger(K)a(P)\rangle_\beta = \delta^3(p-k). \tag{2.11}$$

And using the cyclicity of the trace and the commutation relation $[H,a] = -\omega a$, one arrives at

$$\begin{aligned} \langle a^\dagger(K)a(P)\rangle_\beta &= n_B(\omega)\delta^3(p-k) \\ \langle a(P)a^\dagger(K)\rangle_\beta &= (1+n_B(\omega))\delta^3(p-k), \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

where I have defined the Bose-Einstein statistical weight

$$n_B(\omega) = \frac{1}{e^{\beta\omega}-1}. \tag{2.13}$$

The propagator can then be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} G(X-Y) = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3 2\omega} \quad \Big[\quad & \theta_c(x_0-y_0)e^{-iK\cdot(X-Y)} + \theta_c(y_0-x_0)e^{iK\cdot(X-Y)} \\ & + n_B(\omega)\left(e^{iK\cdot(X-Y)} + e^{-iK\cdot(X-Y)}\right)\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

At this level, one has to specify the contour. As the contour must start from some initial time t_0 and go down to $t_0 - i\beta$, the simplest choice is just a straight line along the imaginary-time axis. This choice of contour leads to the ITF and is the oldest and most widely used formalism in the TFT. Parametrizing $x_0 - y_0 = -i\tau$, one has

$$G(\tau, \vec{x}-\vec{y}) = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3 2\omega} e^{-i\vec{k}.(\vec{x}-\vec{y})}\left[(1+n_B(\omega))e^{-\omega|\tau|} + n_B(\omega)e^{\omega|\tau|}\right]. \tag{2.15}$$

In momentum space, the theory reduces to a 3-dimensional euclidean theory with an infinite summation over the Matsubara frequencies $\omega_n = i2\pi nT, n \in]-\infty, +\infty[$. Explicit calculations show however that is more convenient to stay in τ-space [44].

The obvious disadvantage of this contour is to lose completely the real-time argument. In principle, with this formalism, one is restricted to calculate static thermodynamical quantities as the free energy. This has motivated several people to consider a different contour, which would keep a real-time argument.

The contour of the RTF is shown in fig. 1 and is composed of four different pieces. This is the simplest choice of contour if one wants to have real-time arguments. For analytic reasons, it can be shown that the contributions from C_3 and C_4 can be neglected [1, 45]. One is therefore left with two possibilities for both x_0 and y_0 to lie either on C_1 or C_2. This gives four different propagators, which are usually written in a matrix. They are labelled as "11" propagator, corresponding to $x_0 \in C_1$ and $y_0 \in C_1$, and so on. An appropriate choice of the parameter σ is the intermediate value $\sigma = \beta/2$. In this case, one finds the following form of the complete propagator in momentum space

$$G(K) = \begin{pmatrix} G^{11}(K) & G^{12}(K) \\ G^{21}(K) & G^{22}(K) \end{pmatrix} = U(\beta, K) \begin{pmatrix} \Delta(K) & 0 \\ 0 & \Delta^*(K) \end{pmatrix} U(\beta, K), \qquad (2.16)$$

where

$$U(\beta, K) = \begin{pmatrix} \cosh\theta_K & \sinh\theta_K \\ \sinh\theta_K & \cosh\theta_K \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (2.17)$$

and

$$\cosh\theta_K = \left(1 - e^{-\beta\omega}\right)^{-1/2} \quad , \quad \sinh\theta_K = e^{-\beta\omega/2}\left(1 - e^{-\beta\omega}\right)^{-1/2}. \qquad (2.18)$$

In (2.16), Δ is the Feynman propagator at zero temperature

$$\Delta(K) = \frac{i}{K^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon}. \qquad (2.19)$$

The welcome surprise is that these are just exactly the propagators in TFD. This is a very strong support of the theory in the sense that TFD and the RTF do not use at all the same mathematical framework.

In TFD language, the 2-type propagators: the "12", "21' and "22", are associated to "ghost" fields (not to be mistaken for Fadeev-Popov ghosts!). They are unphysical since one of the time arguments has an imaginary component. The only physical propagator is the "11" component

$$G^{11}(K) = \Delta(K) + 2\pi n_B(\omega)\delta(K^2 - m^2). \qquad (2.20)$$

This propagator was derived in the early attemps at real-time techniques [26]. It clearly shows the finite-temperature contribution in the δ-piece. But, in order to have a consistent theory, the other propagators must also be taken into account.

The Feynman rules in the RTF are the following: diagrams have the same topology as in the vacuum theory, and the same symmetry factors. Furthermore, there are two types of vertices, 1 and 2. Physical legs must always be attached to type-1 vertices, never to type-2 ones. One must sum over all the configurations of type-1 and type-2 vertices according to the above rule. Then, one has to use a $G^{ab}(K)$ propagator between a vertex of type a and a vertex of type b when K flows from a to b. All the rest remains the same as in the vacuum theory.

The Feynman rules shown above are those of a free-field theory. Implementing interactions is rather straightforward and is done in the same way as in vacuum, as all the necessary formalism is already set up. For cubic, $(g/3!)\phi^3$, or quadratic, $(g/4!)\phi^4$, interactions, the Feynman rule is to attach $-ig$ at a type-1 vertex and $+ig$ at a type-2 one. In fact, in order to construct these rules one has to make the assumption that the interaction is adiabatically swichted on and off around $t = 0$, which is just the usual assumption in vacuum theory [46]. In a heat bath, this is certainly questionable, as one might think of any particle in constant interaction with its thermal surrounding. One can phrase the question differently by asking: are there asymptotic states in a heat bath? Indeed, practical calculations show some difficulties [47] and formal considerations seem to give a negative answer [48]. Still, perturbative calculations can make sense, as I will try to show in the next sections.

The field theory at finite temperature is renormalizable, provided the vacuum theory is so. This is intuitively obvious as the thermal corrections all come with a Boltzmann factor that cuts off any ultraviolet divergence. At the perturbative level, the problem appears more subtle, but is clearly not an issue.

The path-integral formulation of the same theory is a straightforward exercise [16]. The generating functional is given by

$$Z[j] = Z[0]\langle T_c \exp\left(i\int_C d^4x j(x)\phi(x)\right)\rangle_\beta, \tag{2.21}$$

and the path is such that $x(t - i\beta) = x(t)$. By differentiation with respect to the sources, one obtains the n-point Green functions:

$$G^n(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \frac{1}{Z[0]}\frac{\delta^n Z[j]}{i\delta j(x_1)\ldots i\delta j(x_n)}\Big|_{j=0}. \tag{2.22}$$

With the contour C shown in fig. 1, the same matrix propagator as in eq. (2.16) is easily recovered. For completeness, I also give the gauge boson "11" propagator in Feynman gauge

$$G^{11}_{\mu\nu}(K) = -g_{\mu\nu}\left(\Delta(K) + 2\pi n_B(\omega)\delta(K^2)\right). \tag{2.23}$$

Similar relations hold for the other components (one just has to multiply the thermal matrix (2.16) by the metric). For Dirac fermions, one has

$$S^{11}_F(K) = (\gamma_\mu K^\mu + m)\left(\Delta(K) - 2\pi N_F(k_0)\delta(K^2 - m^2)\right), \tag{2.24}$$

where the Fermi-Dirac statistical weight has been introduced (in presence of a chemical potential μ)

$$N_F(k_0) = \frac{\theta(k_0)}{e^{\beta(k_0-\mu)}+1} + \frac{\theta(-k_0)}{e^{\beta(-k_0+\mu)}+1}. \tag{2.25}$$

Again, one has to multiply the Dirac structure to the fermionic scalar matrix in order to have the other components. One should also notice that the ghost gauge fields, although anticommutant, obey the Bose-Einstein statistics.

After some initial confusion, there has been a considerable amount of work in the past few years in comparing the different formalisms. The first remark is that, by using the RTF with a free parameter σ, one gets the TFD for $\sigma = \beta/2$, and the Keldysh, or also called the "cut" propagators, for $\sigma = 0$ or $\sigma = \beta$. The comparisons between RTF and ITF are much more complicated, since the Feynman rules are rather different [49]. However, there is now a general agreement that they give the same physical answers [50]. In fact, it is also possible to calculate dynamical quantities in the ITF, by analytic continuation to real-time values $\omega \to k_0 + i\epsilon$. Note that the equivalence between the two formalisms is obtained by taking the analytic continuation $\omega \to k_0 + i\epsilon k_0$. The question of which formalism is the easiest to use is a difficult one. Each has its advantages and its weaknesses, and using one or the other is probably more a matter of taste than of convenience. However, one should note that when dealing with non-equilibrium systems, a real-time approach is mandatory. For systems at equilibrium, the best solution is certainly to use both formalisms, as this provides a useful check on the calculations.

3 Some examples in scalar theory

3.1 Tadpole diagram and comparison between ITF and RTF

The simplest thing to calculate in the TFT is the tadpole diagram in a scalar theory with quadratic interactions as $g\phi^4$ theory. Is may also be the most instructive calculation. The Feyman rules in the ITF give

$$\Sigma = \frac{g}{2} T \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\omega_n^2 + \mathbf{k}^2 + m^2}, \tag{3.1}$$

where $\omega_n = 2in\pi T$. In order to perform the summation over n, the standard trick is to use a contour integral

$$T \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} f(k_0 = i\omega_n) = \frac{T}{2i\pi} \int_C dk_0 f(k_0) \frac{\beta}{2} \coth \frac{\beta k_0}{2}, \tag{3.2}$$

provided $f(k_0)$ has no poles on the imaginary axis. The contour can be deformed in such a way that (see fig. 2)

$$T \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} f(k_0 = i\omega_n) = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \left[\int_{-i\infty}^{+i\infty} dk_0 f(k_0) + \int_{+i\infty}^{-i\infty} dk_0 (f(k_0) + f(-k_0)) \frac{1}{e^{\beta k_0} - 1} \right]. \tag{3.3}$$

This allows us to separate the vacuum part (first term) from the finite-temperature contribution (second term). Using the explicit value of $f(k_0) = 1/(\omega^2 - k_0^2)$ with $\omega = \sqrt{k^2 + m^2}$, one gets for the thermal contribution to the tadpole diagram

$$\Sigma_\beta = \frac{g}{2} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\omega} n_B(\omega). \tag{3.4}$$

This result can be derived in a much simpler way by using the "mixed" propagator [44]

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma &= \frac{g}{2} T \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \int_0^\beta d\tau e^{i\omega_n \tau} \Delta(\tau, \omega) \\ &= \frac{g}{2} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \int_0^\beta d\tau \delta(\tau) \Delta(\tau, \omega) \\ &= \frac{g}{2} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{2\omega} (1 + 2n_B(\omega)). \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

The "1" piece is again the vacuum contribution, which is quadratically ultraviolet-divergent while the "$2n_B$" piece is the finite-temperature contribution.

With the RTF, the separation from $T = 0$ to $T \neq 0$ is automatic from the beginning, so that one can write

$$\Sigma_\beta = \frac{g}{2} \int \frac{d^4K}{(2\pi)^4} 2\pi\delta(K^2 - m^2) n_B(\omega). \tag{3.6}$$

The integration on k_0 can be trivially performed with the help of the δ-function and the same result is obtained as with the ITF.

This one-loop example does not illustrate well the complexity and the relative advantages of each technique, which are observed at higher orders. One can just see that the methods are quite different.

3.2 High-temperature expansion and thermal mass

With this one result in hand, let me continue the discussion. We have

$$\Sigma_\beta = \frac{g}{4\pi^2} \int_m^\infty \frac{k\ d\omega}{e^{\beta\omega} - 1}. \tag{3.7}$$

The remaining integral cannot be computed analytically, except in some limiting cases. Let me discuss the high-temperature limit, which is of greatest interest. One has

$$\Sigma_\beta = \frac{g}{24} T^2 \left(1 - \frac{3}{\pi}\frac{m}{T} - \frac{3}{2\pi^2}\frac{m^2}{T^2} \ln\frac{m}{T} + \ldots \right). \tag{3.8}$$

The tadpole diagram is the first-order correction to the free propagator and therefore the above result is nothing but a mass term (because it is independent of the momentum). In the limit of zero bare mass, one has the contribution

$$m_\beta^2 = \frac{g}{24} T^2. \tag{3.9}$$

This is an *effective* mass and corresponds to the fact that in the heat bath, the propagation of particles is altered by their continuous interactions with the medium. This is certainly one of the most important results of the TFT.

The fact that even massless particles acquire a mass does not affect the chiral symmetry. The thermal mass is generated radiatively and comes from a term that is chiral-symmetric if the initial Lagrangian is.

3.3 Higher orders and infrared problems

In order to see if the perturbation series is well behaved, it is necessary to look at higher orders. At two-loop order, two different topologies contribute (see fig. 3). According to the RTF rules, one has for the first topology

$$\Sigma_a^{(2)}(K) = -i\frac{g^2}{4}\int \frac{d^4P}{(2\pi)^4} D_{11}^2(P) \int \frac{d^4K}{(2\pi)^4}(D_{11}^2(K) - D_{12}^2(K)), \tag{3.10}$$

where I have used the fact that the type-2 tadpole is identical to the type-1 tadpole. It is interesting to note that

$$D_{11}^2(K) - D_{12}^2(K) = \Delta^2(K) - 2PP\frac{1}{K^2 - m^2} 2\pi\delta(K^2 - m^2) n_B(\omega). \tag{3.11}$$

Thus, even if there are multiple products of statistical weights at intermediate stages of the calculation, they disappear when combining the different type-1 and 2 vertices. Also disappear the ill-defined δ-products. This is a generic feature of the RTF. In fact, a general theorem can be stated: there appears at most only one statistical factor (or a sum of) in a loop integral. This is obvious in the ITF, because it is the summation over the Matsubara frequencies that gives the statistical weight.

As usual, the ultra-violet singularities in eq. (3.10) can be eliminated by choosing some suitable counter-terms (in fact the same counter-terms as at $T = 0$). Notice, however, that all topologies must be added in order to cancel the ultra-violet divergences, with a non-trivial mixing between T-dependent and T-independent terms [51]. In the high-temperature limit, the contribution to the thermal mass becomes

$$\delta m_\beta^{2\ (2)} = -\frac{g^2}{384\pi} T^2 \left(\frac{T}{m} + \dots\right), \tag{3.12}$$

and is infrared-singular when $m \to 0$. This power-like singularity originates solely from the first topology in fig. 3. Although infrared singularities are inherent in almost all perturbation theories, whether at zero or finite temperature, there are good reasons to worry about this one: i) the above contribution enters as a correction to the thermal mass, and therefore participates into the solution of the pole of the propagator, which is supposed to be a physical quantity [52]; ii) at zero temperature, famous theorems as the Kinoshita-Lee-Nauenberg theorem [53, 54] demonstrate that singularities appearing at intermediate stages of the calculation cancel in the final

physical result. However, a crucial argument of the Lee-Nauenberg version of the theorem is the finiteness of the mass shift at all orders [54], which is just the quantity considered here; iii) indeed, this mass shift will enter into physical quantities as it acts as a kinematical cut-off and will appear, say, in the production rate of light weakly coupled particles from the heat bath.

So, what can be done with this infrared singularity? If it cannot be cancelled, then one solution is to use an infrared regulator. In fact, an obvious infrared regulator is just the thermal mass obtained at first order, m_β. In that case, the resulting behaviour is

$$\delta m_\beta^{2\ (2)} = O(g\sqrt{g}T^2). \tag{3.13}$$

That is, the result is still perturbatively acceptable as it is smaller than the previous correction. Unfortunately, this hope does not survive higher-order corrections. Indeed, by attaching an arbitrary number of tadpoles to the first line (see fig. 4), one gets always the same correction

$$\delta m_\beta^{2\ (N)} = O(g\sqrt{g}T^2). \tag{3.14}$$

An infinite number of diagrams contribute to the same order in the coupling constant. This clearly shows the breakdown of perturbation series at finite temperature.

On the other hand, this infinite subset of the most infrared diagrams can be resummed. It is nothing but a Taylor expansion [51]

$$\sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \frac{m_\beta^{2N}}{N!} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial m^2}\right)^N \int_m^\infty \frac{k\ d\omega}{e^{\beta\omega}-1}\Big|_{m=0} = \int_{m_\beta}^\infty \frac{k\ d\omega}{e^{\beta\omega}-1}. \tag{3.15}$$

The right-hand side of this equation is perfectly defined for any value of the coupling constant g. Seen from this perspective, the infrared problem originates from the bad expansion of $\sqrt{g}$ around zero.

The resummed result is not very different from the first-order correction, m_β, which, in the light of the above equation, is not surprising. This seems to make perturbation theory at finite temperature reliable. I will come back to this important point in the last section.

3.4 Phase transitions

The appearance of a thermal mass has another important consequence. Consider a bare Lagrangian given by

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi) = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \phi)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\mu^2\phi^2 - \frac{g}{4!}\phi^4. \tag{3.16}$$

This Lagrangian has a *negative* square-mass term. The minimum of the effective potential is degenerate and occurs for non-zero values of the field. Now, the temperature introduces a *positive* square-mass term. The effective potential at high temperature then looks very different

$$V(\phi_c) = \frac{g}{48}T^2\phi_c^2 + \frac{g}{4!}\phi_c^4, \tag{3.17}$$

as it has only one minimum at $\phi_c = 0$. Hence, there must be a *phase transition* between the high- and the low-temperature regime. Whether this phase transition is of first or of second order is another question, which requires to take into account some subleading terms [29]. Still, this is an important result, which has truly modified our way of thinking about the early universe. Any symmetry that is spontaneously broken in our present world, which is a low-temperature system ($T = 3$ K), will be eventually restored if going to sufficiently early times. This is true for instance for the Higgs mechanism, which is responsible for all the particle masses. Above $T \gtrsim 1$ TeV, all particles become massless.

This feature is not specific to $g\phi^4$ theory. With $g\phi^3$ interactions in a 6-dimensional space-time, the theory becomes completely unstable above a certain critical temperature, which can be computed exactly [55]. Phase transitions do also exist in gauge theories [27, 29].

4 The resummation of Braaten and Pisarski

4.1 The idea

We have seen in the previous section that in order to get rid of infrared problems, one has to resum a certain class of diagrams. However, as shown above in the case of the thermal mass, it is not always necessary to perform this resummation if one is not

interested in higher-order corrections. In the following, I will present a set of simple rules that determine in which case one has to resum infrared diagrams. The method is due to Braaten and Pisarski [56, 57] and works also for gauge theories.

Consider $g^2\phi^4$ theory at very high temperature, so high that all other scales as for instance the bare mass, can be neglected. Still, possible other scales can be generated radiatively as gT, or "non-perturbatively" as $(\ln g)T$. The starting point of the BPR is to make a distinction between *hard* momenta of order T and *soft* momenta of order gT. The second step is to realize that the thermal mass is generated by a loop integral, where the momentum running inside the loop is hard. This is clearly what gives the g^2T^2 contribution to m_β^2. Soft momenta give higher-order contributions as g^3T^2 terms. The hard momentum contribution to the loop integral is called a *hard thermal loop* (HTL). The third and final step consists in resumming only soft lines. Indeed, the corrections to the bare propagator K^2 being of order g^2T^2, they start to be relevant only when $K \sim gT$, which is the soft scale. Hard lines do not need to be resummed and one can still use the bare perturbation series.

With these simple rules, one has an improved perturbation theory. For an n-point Green function, the dominant contribution always comes from the HTL, which is of order g^nT^2. If there is no HTL inside the loop, the integral must be cut into two pieces, a first piece where the momentum running inside the loop is hard, for which one uses bare propagators, and a second piece where one has to use resummed propagators as the loop-momentum becomes soft. The final result should be independent of the arbitrary intermediate cut-off of order $\sqrt{g}T$, which is put by hand to separate the two pieces.

In $g^2\phi^4$ theory, there is only one HTL, which is the tadpole diagram. Therefore only the 2-point Green function needs to be resummed. The effective Lagrangian that leads to the improved perturbation series can be written as [58]

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu\phi)^2 - \frac{1}{2}m_\beta^2\phi^2, \tag{4.1}$$

with m_β given by eq. (3.9).

The very nice surprise of the BPR is that these features survive when considering gauge field theories. In QED, the 2-,3- and 4-point Green functions have an HTL. The same is true in QCD, where the n-point Green function with only external gluon

lines, or with $n-2$ gluon lines and 2 quark lines, must also be taken into account. In these cases though, HTLs are not just scalars but complicated analytic functions of the external momenta, $g^n T^2 f(\omega_i, k_i)$. Another surprise is also that these functions are the same for QED and QCD (at least for the same number of bosonic and fermionic external lines). Finally, there are two extra bonuses: i) the HTLs are gauge-invariant and ii) they obey simple Ward identities.

The HTLs can be derived from an effective Lagrangian given by [58]

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} = \frac{1}{2} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + \bar{\psi} \gamma_\mu D^\mu \psi + \frac{3}{2} \omega_0^2 F^{\mu\alpha} \langle \frac{K_\alpha K_\beta}{-(K.D)^2} \rangle F^{\beta\mu} + m_\beta^2 \bar{\psi} \langle \frac{\gamma_\mu K^\mu}{K.D} \rangle \psi, \qquad (4.2)$$

where $\langle\rangle$ refers to an angular average; K is the hard loop momentum; the two parameters ω_0 and m_β are the plasmon frequency and the thermal fermion mass respectively (of order gT). With this Lagrangian, one has an improved perturbation series defined in terms of effective propagators and vertices (they are pictured in fig. 5 in the case of QED).

In the next section, I shall present and discuss the HTLs for the bosonic and fermionic self-energies.

4.2 The bosonic hard thermal self-energy

An important consequence of the fact that the plasma constitutes a privileged rest frame is that the polarization operator can be decomposed into two different propagating modes, transverse and longitudinal (contrary to the vacuum case, both are physical):

$$\Pi_{\mu\nu}(K) = P_{\mu\nu} \Pi_T(K) + Q_{\mu\nu} \Pi_L(K). \qquad (4.3)$$

Expressions for the projectors can be found in [59]. The HTL is obtained by taking the high-temperature limit and by considering a soft external momentum, $\omega, k \ll T$. After renormalization of the ultra-violet zero temperature piece, the thermal corrections for each mode are

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_T(K) &= \frac{3}{2} \omega_0^2 \left(\frac{\omega^2}{k^2} + \left(1 - \frac{\omega^2}{k^2} \right) \frac{\omega}{2k} \ln \frac{\omega + k}{\omega - k} \right) \\ \Pi_L(K) &= 3 \omega_0^2 \left(1 - \frac{\omega^2}{k^2} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\omega}{2k} \ln \frac{\omega + k}{\omega - k} \right), \end{aligned} \qquad (4.4)$$

where ω_0 is given by

$$\omega_0^2 = \left(\frac{N_f}{2} + N\right)\frac{g^2T^2}{9}, \tag{4.5}$$

for an $SU(N)$ gauge theory with N_f fermions. For QED, one has to substitute $(N_f/2+N)g^2 \to e^2$. Identical expressions are obtained in the ultra-degenerate limit, $\mu \gg T$, except for ω_0, which scales with μ instead of T. When the fermion mass is not negligible, these expressions differ only slightly [37, 38].

Of course, the above results are nothing new for QED, where they were derived already a long time ago using the kinetic theory [60]. In that case, ω_0 is the *plasmon frequency*, at which the electric charges oscillate in the plasma around their average positions. Because of this analogy, it is possible to call ω_0 the plasmon frequency for the general $SU(N)$ gauge theory case. In fact, it is quite remarkable that expressions (4.4) are so general.

In arbitrary covariant gauge with parameter ξ, the resummed gauge propagator is (in the ITF)

$$-i\mathbf{D}_{\mu\nu}(K) = \frac{P_{\mu\nu}}{K^2 - \Pi_T(K)} + \frac{Q_{\mu\nu}}{K^2 - \Pi_L(K)} - (\xi - 1)\frac{K_\mu K\nu}{K^4}. \tag{4.6}$$

The two poles of this resummed propagator define two propagation modes (plasmons), which, because of the complicated structure of eqs. (4.4), are described by non-trivial dispersion relations. They are plotted in fig. 6. Notice that when $k \to 0$, they both tend to the same value, $\omega = \omega_0$, which can then be regarded as a *plasmon mass*.

There are also contributions below the light-cone, as the HTLs develop an imaginary part there. In the static limit, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Re}\Pi_T(\omega \to 0, k) &= k_D^2\frac{\omega^2}{k^2}, \\ \mathrm{Re}\Pi_L(\omega \to 0, k) &= k_D^2, \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

where k_D is the *Debye mass* corresponding to the screening of static electric fields (again following the same analogy with QED). Indeed, one finds that in non-degenerate plasmas $k_D^2 = e^2N_e/T$ and in degenerate plasmas $k_D^2 = (e^2/\pi^2)\mu p_F$. For ultra-relativistic plasmas, $k_D^2 = 3\omega_0^2$. Notice that k_D also appears in the expression for the transverse propagator. However, it vanishes when $\omega \to 0$. Hence, *there is no screening for space-like transverse gauge bosons*. This has a very important consequence as the resummation of Braaten and Pisarski is essentially based upon the

presence of a mass term of order g^2T^2 in the 2-point HTL. The transverse (or better called magnetic) mass can only be of higher order, that is $m_{mag} = O(g^2T)$. In fact, it is exactly zero at all orders for QED [61]. This is at the origin of the infrared problem in hot gauge theories [61, 62]. For an $SU(N)$ gauge theory ($N > 1$) and beyond some order in the perturbative coupling constant, an infinite number of graphs contribute to the same order, due to diagrams with multiple interacting space-like transverse gauge bosons. In QED, or for a gauge theory at finite density, there is always enough screening coming from the fermionic loops so the problem does not seem to be so worrying. However, we shall see in the last section that there might be an alternative to this problem.

Quite unfortunately, the literature contains may examples of confusion between the Debye and the plasmon masses. They are totally unrelated. The former acts as a screening mass for space-like longitudinal photons (for instance in a fermion scattering on a target). The latter damps the boson density in the plasma by a factor $e^{-\omega_0/T}$.

4.3 The fermionic hard thermal self-energy

Following the same procedure as in the last section, the fermionic HTL is found to be

$$\Sigma(K) = m_\beta^2 \left(\frac{1}{2k} \ln \frac{\omega + k}{\omega - k} \gamma_0 + \left(1 - \frac{\omega}{2k} \ln \frac{\omega + k}{\omega - k} \right) \frac{\mathbf{k}.\gamma}{k^2} \right), \tag{4.8}$$

where m_β is another thermal mass given by

$$m_\beta^2 = c_F \frac{g^2 T^2}{8}, \tag{4.9}$$

and $c_F = (N^2 - 1)/(2N)$ is a color factor. In QED, one has to substitute $c_F g^2 \to e^2$. By looking at the pole of the resummed propagator,

$$-i\mathbf{S_F}(K) = \frac{1}{\not{K} - \Sigma(K)}, \tag{4.10}$$

one finds, unexpectedly, *two solutions*. They are plotted in fig. 7. The first solution (+) corresponds obviously to the modified fermion propagation in the plasma, but there does not seem to be any intuitive physical interpretation for the second solution (−), apart from the fact that it arrives as a pure collective effect [63]. This is

a completely new feature, which was not seen before the TFT was used [64]. Unfortunately, there seem to be no important phenomenological consequences of this new mode, sometimes called "plasmino" [65].

4.4 Damping rates

The resummation program of Braaten and Pisarski was in fact developed to solve the long-standing problem of getting a gauge-independent answer for the gluon damping rate [66].

The damping rates are computed through the discontinuity of self-energies at the pole of the propagator and have the following physical role: consider a particle distribution that is slightly out of equilibrium. One has [67]

$$\frac{dn(\omega,t)}{dt} = -n(\omega,t)\Gamma_a(\omega) + (1+\sigma n(\omega,t))\Gamma_c(\omega), \tag{4.11}$$

where Γ_a and Γ_e are the absorption and creation rates of the given particle, respectively. Notice the different statistical factors for incoming and outgoing particles, with the parameter σ to distinguish bosons ($\sigma = 1$) from fermions ($\sigma = -1$).

Equation (4.11) has for general solution

$$n(\omega,t) = \frac{\Gamma_c}{\Gamma_a - \sigma\Gamma_c} + C(\omega)e^{-(\Gamma_a - \sigma\Gamma_c)t}, \tag{4.12}$$

where $C(\omega)$ is an arbitrary function, which does not depend on time. Creation and absorption rates are related by the relation

$$\Gamma_a(\omega) = e^{\beta\omega}\Gamma_c(\omega), \tag{4.13}$$

which is nothing but the KMS relation, written in a different form. Using (4.13) we have

$$n(\omega,t) = \frac{1}{e^{\beta\omega} - \sigma} + C(\omega)e^{-2\gamma t}, \tag{4.14}$$

where $\gamma = (\Gamma_a - \sigma\Gamma_c)/2$ is defined as the *damping rate*. Therefore, its physical interpretation is rather clear. It represents the inverse time scale it takes for a thermal distribution to reach equilibrium. In particular, the sign of the damping rate is of crucial importance as, if negative, the system is obviously unstable.

One can therefore imagine the controversy, which has lasted for many years, as the sign of the gluon damping rate was found to be dependent on the gauge choice! Braaten and Pisarski have shown that in order to get a consistent result, one has to use their effective perturbation theory [66].

How to compute damping rates? The creation and absorption rates are related to the imaginary part of the self-energy [67]. In the RTF, Kobes and Semenoff have extended the cutting rules (or Cutkosky rules) to the finite temperature case [68]. Again, results are similar in the ITF and in the RTF.

From the results shown above, eqs. (4.4) and (4.8), it is easy to see that there is no HTL for the damping rates. Indeed, the HTLs have an imaginary part only below the light-cone, whereas the pole of the propagator is clearly above it. Therefore, the damping rates must be of higher order, g^2T, which makes them difficult to compute. Indeed, in order to go beyond the leading order in the BPR, one has to subdivide diagrams into different pieces, according to whether the internal lines carry hard or soft momenta. For soft external gluons, one has to use effective vertices and propagators (see fig. 8). For transverse and longitudinal gluons at rest (!) the result is [66]

$$\gamma_T = \gamma_L \simeq 0.264013 g^2 T. \tag{4.15}$$

So the sign is positive and independent of the gauge, which implies that the quark-gluon plasma is perturbatively stable.

The case of a hard external gluon turns out to be very interesting, as there appears a singular behaviour that can only be cut by introducing a higher order cut-off of the type m_{mag} or γ_T itself [69]. In this case, effective vertices are not used and only one soft internal line is resummed. Only the transverse gluon damping rate diverges and is found to be [69]

$$\gamma_T = \frac{g^2 NT}{8\pi}\left(\ln\frac{\omega_0^2}{m_{mag}^2 + 2m_{mag}\gamma_T} + 1.09681\ldots\right). \tag{4.16}$$

Hence, γ_T appears both on the left-hand side and on the right-hand side of the equation. In order to get this result, one has to use a resummed propagator also for the one hard internal line, which has nothing to do with the resummed propagator of Braaten and Pisarski. In fact, this propagator does not resum the HTL, but some other contribution. The result is also sensitive to the magnetic mass. This is bad

in the sense that nobody knows how to calculate this parameter consistently, except by going on the lattice. However, this uncertainty shows up only at the logarithmic level and has therefore very little phenomenological implications. The coefficient in front of the logarithm is on the other hand perfectly well known, and is consistently obtained by using the BPR.

The damping rates for fermions have similar features. What of hot QED, where the magnetic mass vanishes? There, it seems that there is no consistent way to get the damping rate [69, 70] and the problem is still open. Among the possible different solutions, the simplest could be that there is no pole at all in the fermion propagator [71]! It is also legitimate to ask the physical relevance of a quantity that is defined at a complex energy! On the other hand, one may note that the creation and absorption rates of fermions travelling through a heat bath are perfectly defined and are of order $g^2T\ln(1/g)$, as expected [72].

4.5 Final remarks

When computing at finite temperature, there appear singularities as in any other quantum field theory. Ultra-violet singularities are the same as in vacuum and are disposed of by renormalization. Infrared singularities occur when a momentum is vanishing and collinear divergences when a line goes on shell. According to the previous discussion, the singularity can be screened by using a resummed propagator or vertex. However, terms that generate infrared singularities are not the same as those that generate the HTLs. Indeed, a typical on-shell expansion of the self-energy is (at first order in g)

$$\Sigma(K) = ag^2T^2\int dx\frac{x}{e^x-1} + bg^2K^2\int\frac{dx}{x}\frac{1}{e^x-1}, \tag{4.17}$$

where a and b are numerical factors. The first term is proportional to T^2 and represents the HTL. The second term is infrared-singular and *a priori* infinite if one does not regularize in some way. However, by resummation, we know: i) that there are thermal cut-offs of order gT and ii) that the particle on-shellness is restricted to $K^2 \sim g^2T^2$ whether it is soft or hard. Therefore, the second contribution is of order $g^2 \times g^2T^2(1/g) \sim g^3T^2$ and is smaller than the HTL. It is clear then, for the BPR to

work, that the term with the screened singularity must contribute less than the term of the HTL. This happens to be true indeed, except of course in the case where there is no screening, i.e., when the soft line is a magnetic boson. On the other hand, it has also been found that those kinds of infrared singularities can cancel out in the physical answer. Indeed, although a complete general proof is still lacking, there is by now enough accumulated evidence that the KLN theorem works also at finite temperature [41, 42, 73].

Hence, the resummation of Braaten and Pisarski seems really to work well and certainly oversteps its original goals. Even in the case when the weak coupling limit is not justified, this separation between soft and hard scales can be used as a mathematical trick, which is certainly more elegant than any other method. I only want for proof the numerous computations using these techniques [32-36,42,43,58,65,69].

5 Conclusion

The list of references shows by its length that the TFT is now a mature field, with a growing activity over the last few years. A number of important questions have already been answered, such as for instance the comparisons between the different formalisms. The main difficulties of the TFTs are of course infrared singularities. A lot of effort has been done and the situation can be grossly summarized as follows: one can make reliable perturbative calculations when probing the thermal system at a scale T. By using the resummation of Braaten and Pisarski one can go down to the scale gT. The next step is to probe the magnetic mass scale, g^2T, onto which very little is known.

There are many issues which are still unresolved. For instance, nobody knows exactly what the behavior of the running coupling constant is at finite temperature, and even if the question is relevant or not [74].

Finally, I could not end this paper without mentioning the interesting connection between thermal and topological field theories as, for instance, the fact that the Minkowski vacuum agrees with a thermal state for an accelerated observer [75].

Acknowledgements

This paper is based upon lectures given at the IST (Lisbon, Nov. 92) and at CERN (Geneva, Jan. 93). I thank both organisers, J. Seixas and L. Alvarez-Gaumé, for the opportunity to discuss these issues with an enthusiastic audience.

References

[1] N. P. Landsman and Ch. G. van Weert, Phys. Rep. **145** (1987) 141.

[2] J. Kapusta, *Finite Temperature Field Theory* (Cambridge University Press, 1989).

[3] R. C. Tolman, *The Principles of Statistical Mechanics* (Oxford University Press, 1938).

[4] L. V. Keldysh, Sov. Phys. **20** (1964) 1018.

[5] T. Arimitsu and H. Umezawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **74** (1985) 429, **77** (1987) 32 and **77** (1987) 53; H. Matsumoto, Prog. Theor. Phys. **79** (1988) 373.

[6] A. J. Niemi, Phys. Lett. **B203** (1988) 425.

[7] E. Calzetta and B. L. Hu, Phys. Rev. **D37** (1988) 2878.

[8] H. A. Weldon, Ann. Phys. (NY) **193** (1989) 166 and **193** (1989) 177; A. Niégawa and A. Takashiba, Proc. of the Workshop on High Temperature Field Theory, Winnipeg, July 1992; M. Chaichian and I. Sendo, Nucl. Phys. **B396** (1993) 737.

[9] S. Ichimaru, *Plasma Physics, An Introduction to Statistical Physics of Charged Particles* (Benjamin-Cummings, Menlo Park, 1986).

[10] E. M. Lifshitz and L. P. Pitaevskii, *Statistical Physics* (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1980).

[11] A. L. Fetter and J. D. Walecka, *Quantum Theory of Many-Particle Systems*, (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971).

[12] For a recent review, see M. Le Bellac, Lectures given at the 30th Schladming Winter School, Schladming, Austria, 1991.

[13] Proc. of the Workshops on *Thermal Field Theories and their applications*:, Physica **A158** (1989) 1-558 and H. Ezawa, T. Arimitsu and Y. Mashimoto, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1991.

[14] J. Schwinger, J. Math. Phys. **2** (1961) 407.

[15] R. Mills, *Propagators for Many-Particle Systems* (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1969).

[16] R. L. Kobes, G. W. Semenoff and N. Weiss, Z. Phys. **C29** (1985) 371.

[17] R. Haag, Commun. Math. Phys. **5** (1967) 215.

[18] H. Ezawa, in *Quantum Field Theory*, ed. F. Mancini (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1986).

[19] T. Matsubara, Prog. Theor. Phys. **14** (1955) 351.

[20] H. Umezawa, H. Matsumoto and M. Tachiki, *Thermo Field Dynamics and Condensed States* (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1982).

[21] I. Ojima, Ann. Phys. (NY) **137** (1981) 1.

[22] K. Enqvist and K. Eskola, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A5** (1990) 1919.

[23] J. C. Mather et al., Astrophy. J. **354** (1990) L37; G. F. Smoot et al., Astrophys. J. **396** (1992) L1.

[24] S. Weinberg, *Cosmology and Gravitation* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1970).

[25] C. W. Bernard, Phys. Rev. **D12** (1974) 3312.

[26] L. Dolan and R. Jackiw, Phys. Rev. **D9** (1974) 3320.

[27] A. Linde, Rep. Prog. Phys. **42** (1979) 389.

[28] K. Olive, Phys. Rep. **190** (1990) 307.

[29] For a list of references, see R. G. Leigh, Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on High Energy Physics, Dallas, 1992.

[30] R. Baier, E. Pilon, B. Pire and D. Schiff, Nucl. Phys. **B336** (1990) 157.

[31] A. Rebhan, Nucl. Phys. **B351** (1991) 706 and **B368** (1992) 479; U. Kraemmer and A. Rebhan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67** (1991) 793.

[32] T. Altherr and K. Kainulainen, Phys. Lett. **B262** (1991) 79.

[33] T. Altherr, Z. Phys. **C47** (1990) 559 and Ann. Phys. (NY) **207** (1991) 374.

[34] E. Braaten and T. C. Yuan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66** (1991) 2183.

[35] E. Braaten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66** (1991) 1655.

[36] T. Altherr and U. Kraemmer, Astroparticle Phys. **1** (1992) 133.

[37] T. Altherr, E. Petitgirard and T. del Rio Gaztelurrutia, to appear in Astroparticle Physics.

[38] E. Braaten and D. Segel, Northwestern Univ. preprint NUHEP-TH-93-1.

[39] J. Cleymans, R. V. Gavai and E. Suhonen, Phys. Rep. **130** (1986) 217.

[40] H. Satz, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **35** (1985) 245.

[41] R. Baier, B. Pire and D. Schiff, Phys. Rev. **D38** (1988) 2814; T. Altherr, P. Aurenche and T. Becherrawy, Nucl. Phys. **B315** (1989) 436; T. Altherr and P. Aurenche, Z. Phys. **C45** (1989) 99; T. Altherr and T. Becherrawy, Nucl. Phys. **B330** (1990) 174; Y. Gabellini, T. Grandou and D. Poizat, Ann. Phys. (NY) **202** (1990) 436.

[42] T. Altherr and P. V. Ruuskanen, Nucl. Phys. **B380** (1992) 377.

[43] E. Braaten, R. D. Pisarski and T. Chiang Yuan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** (1990) 2242; E. Braaten and M. Thoma, Phys. Rev. **D44** (1991) 1298; J. Kapusta, P. Lichard and D. Seibert, Phys. Rev. **D44** (1991) 2744; R. Baier, H. Nakkagawa, A. Niégawa and K. Redlich, Z. Phys. **C53** (1992) 433.

[44] R. D. Pisarski, Nucl. Phys. **B309** (1988) 476.

[45] T. S. Evans, Phys. Rev. **D47** (1993) R4196.

[46] A. A. Abrikosov, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A5** (1990) 2183.

[47] T. Altherr and P. Aurenche, Phys. Rev. **D40** (1989) 4171; M. Le Bellac and D. Poizat, Z. Phys. **C47** (1990) 125.

[48] N. P. Landsmann, Ann. Phys. (NY) **186** (1988) 141.

[49] Y. Fujimoto, R. Grigjanis and H. Nishino, Phys. Lett. **B141** (1984) 83; Y. Fujimoto and R. Grigjanis, Z. Phys. **C28** (1985) 395.

[50] R. Kobes, Phys. Rev. **D42** (1990) 562, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67** (1991) 1384; T. S. Evans, Phys. Lett. **B249** (1990) 286 and **B252** (1990) 108, and Nucl. Phys. **B374** (1992) 340; P. Aurenche and T. Becherrawy, Nucl. Phys. **B379** (1992) 259; M. A. van Eijck and Ch. G. van Weert, Phys. Lett. **B278** (1992) 305.

[51] T. Altherr, Phys. Lett. **B238** (1990) 360.

[52] R. Kobes, G. Kunstater and A. Rebhan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** (1990) 2992 and Nucl. Phys. **B355** (1991) 1.

[53] T. Kinoshita, J. Math. Phys. **3** (1962) 650.

[54] T. D. Lee and M. Nauenberg, Phys. Rev. **133** (1964) 1549.

[55] T. Altherr, T. Grandou and R. D. Pisarski, Phys. Lett. **B271** (1991) 183.

[56] R. D. Pisarski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63** (1989) 1129.

[57] E. Braaten and R. D. Pisarski, Nucl. Phys. **B337** (1990) 569 and **B339** (1990) 310.

[58] E. Braaten and R. D. Pisarski, Phys. Rev. **D45** (1992) 1827.

[59] H. A. Weldon, Phys. Rev. **D26** (1982) 1394.

[60] V. P. Silin, Sov. Phys. JETP **11** (1960) 1136.

[61] D. J. Gross, R. D. Pisarski and L. G. Yaffe, Rev. Mod. Phys. **53** (1981) 43.

[62] A. Linde, Phys. Lett. **B93** (1980) 327.

[63] H. A. Weldon, Physica **A158** (1989) 169.

[64] G. Baym, J.-P. Blaizot and B. Svetitsky, Phys. Rev. **D46** (1992) 4043.

[65] E. Braaten, Astrophys. J. **392** (1992) 70.

[66] E. Braaten and R. D. Pisarski, Phys. Rev. **D42** (1990) 2156.

[67] H. A. Weldon, Phys. Rev. **D28** (1983) 2007.

[68] R. L. Kobes and G. W. Semenoff, Nucl. Phys. **B260** (1985) 714 and **B272** (1986) 329; N. Ashida, H. Nakkagawa, A. Niégawa and H. Yokota, Ann. Phys. (NY) **215** (1992) 315.

[69] R. D. Pisarski, Phys. Rev. **D47** (1993) 5859.

[70] R. Baier and A. Niégawa, Proc. of the Workshop on High Temperature Field Theory, Winnipeg, July 1992.

[71] S. Peigné, E. Pilon and D. Schiff, Orsay Univ. preprint LPTHE 93-13.

[72] T. Altherr, E. Petitgirard and T. del Rio Gaztelurrutia, Phys. Rev. **D47** (1993) 703.

[73] T. Grandou, M. Le Bellac and J. L. Meunier, Z. Phys. **C45** (1989) 575; T. Grandou, M. Le Bellac and D. Poizat, Phys. Lett. **B249** (1990) 478 and Nucl. Phys. **B358** (1991) 408; T. Altherr, Phys. Lett. **B262** (1991) 314; H. A. Weldon, Phys. Rev. **D44** (1991) 3955; M. Le Bellac and P. Reynaud, Nucl. Phys. **B380** (1992) 423; A. Niégawa and K. Takashiba, Nucl. Phys. **B370** (1992) 335; T. Altherr and T. Grandou, to appear in Nucl. Phys. B; A. Niégawa, Osaka Univ. preprint, OCU-PHYS-149, May 1993.

[74] K. Enqvist and K. Kainulainen, Z. Phys. **C53** (1992) 87; P. Aurenche, E. Petitgirard and T. del Rio Gaztelurrutia, Phys. Lett. **B297** (1993) 337.

[75] Y.-X. Gui, Phys. Rev. **D46** (1992) 46.

Figure Captions

Fig. 1 The real-time contour in the complex-time plane.

Fig. 2 The deformed contour for calculating (3.2) in the ITF.

Fig. 3 The two topologies for the self-energy at 2-loop order.

Fig. 4 A "daisy" diagram with an arbitrary number of loops attached to the tadpole.

Fig. 5 The effective propagators and vertices.

Fig. 6 The dispersion relations for the bosonic modes.

Fig. 7 The dispersion relations for the fermionic modes.

Fig. 8 The resummed diagrams for the soft gluon damping rates.